



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXI, I.

WHOLE NO. 121.

I.—SERVIANA.

In the times of the Italian Humanists Vergil and Servius were generally named together, as we see in the letters of Filelfo. Within a short time after the beginning of printing not less than six editions of Servius were struck from the press. For Vergil still maintained his canonic place in European education. Even in the generation of the maturity of Ritschl and Madvig the following fervid words were penned by Suringar: *solas Servii lucubrationes maioris pretii aestimandas esse quam coniunctas omnium reliquorum scholiastarum vigilias*. I do not intend to contribute anything here—unless *in transitu*—to the problem of the Servius *plenior* and *brevior*, or whether the additions of Daniel (1600) are from a fuller, but authentic Servius, or not.¹

As a rule the students of Vergil alone concern themselves with Servius, in our day. Among ourselves indeed, I fear not even all of them. For, to speak candidly, Vergil in America hardly anywhere emerges from the elementary place, to which the cast-iron tradition of our scholastic habits has long reduced him.

But Vergil is not, strictly speaking, fitted for children or very young people. And this is not merely my own opinion. "In Deutschland verblich sein Glanz," says Fr. Leo of Vergil (*Die Griechische u. Lateinische Literatur und Sprache*, p. 349), "mit

¹ Thilo thinks that the shorter articles alone are by Servius; Ribbeck holds that both longer and shorter articles are excerpts from the genuine commentary of Servius. Nettleship is not prepared to pronounce definitely. Scaliger was of opinion that the Servius which had come down to him was but a reduced total of exegetical matter: *cuius commentariorum tantum hodie cadaver habemus monachorum barbarie et spurcitia contaminatum*—an opinion which greatly impressed Thilo.

der Entdeckung Homer's im 18. Jahrhundert; nicht in England und Frankreich. Jetzt lebt er in der Schule fort, *für die er zu schwer ist*" . . . The Seminar of Professor Minton Warren in his day, in Baltimore, made a beginning of Servian study among us, as is proved by the theses of Professors Moore (of Vassar) and Mustard. Perhaps the subjoined studies may give a renewed impulse to these pursuits: May we not, in this connection, express the hope that Thilo's labors may become available in a Teubner text form, as is Porphyrio on Horace.

I.

Is it possible to gain a close vision of the personality of Servius? Or indeed is he merely a pen, an excerptor, a summarizing librariolus and grammaticus? Or is it not perhaps possible, nay impressively clear, that he too gathered in his own soul and so reflected too, something of the times in which he lived, the times of Symmachus and St. Ambrose, of Theodosius and Praetextatus?

Nettleship speaks of these things in a general and somewhat vague manner:¹ It is plain, I think, that the commentary of Servius is the work of an adherent of the old religion. It is not merely that its author gives no sign of any leaning to christianity, or knowledge of it, but that he shows a decided fondness for the forms and antiquities of the old Roman worship. Taking the commentary as a whole, I am inclined to characterize it as one of the works which, like the *Saturnalia*² of Macrobius, marks the reaction in favor of the past, which took place among the Roman literati at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries A. D.

To determine the time of Servius, we will, for the present, respect the dissent of Nettleship and forbear availing ourselves of the data afforded us by Macrobius.

The latest author indeed (of whom we have knowledge), cited by our Servius (Aen. 10, 272) is 'Avienus, qui iambis scripsit Vergilii fabulas': Avienus, to whom Jerome refers as to one who wrote '*recently*'.³

¹ The Ancient Commentators on Vergil; Conington-Nettleship's Vergil, vol. I, p. cv.

² And the treatise on the Somnium Scipionis, fully as much.

³ Teuffel, Litt.-Gesch., § 420, 2.

But there are other data, and particularly a class of references which I would now beg to present to the attention of my readers. I mean the citations of Donatus. These in the main are put forward coupled with criticism and censure, we may fairly say, they are filled with a censorious spirit. It is quite probable, nay it is evident, that of the long line of Vergilian commentators quoted by Servius, Aelius Donatus was the last. He was 'orator urbis Romae', 'grammaticus urbis Romae', in fact he was 'magister urbis', flourishing about 350 A. D., and a preceptor of Jerome himself. The introductory preface of his commentary¹ is so significant for our general theme that I must set down here a few matters implied or expressed there.

Not only could a scholar in Rome study, in that generation, pretty nearly all those (i. e. commentators) who gained mastery in Vergil, but it was possible for Donatus to set down the *very words*², and not merely their points or matters. *Verba servare* preserve the very diction and text of these commentators.

They were extant, in the libraries of Rome; e. g., the one of Apollo, on the Palatine, or in the library bearing the name of Trajan. Whether the average grammaticus, however, was not generally contented with the routine matter of the class-room,³ we may well doubt. For his pupils were young, when they read Vergil. Donatus then claimed credit for this very practice of making literal transcripts from the best Vergilian commentators; e. g., from Verrius Flaccus, Hyginus, Cornutus, Asper, the great scholar Valerius Probus of Berytus, Terentius Scaurus, Sulpicius Apollinaris who taught Gellius, down to his own times. Positive contributions to Vergilian exegesis, after the era of Hadrian and

¹ Published by E. Wölfflin, *Philologus* 24, 154 with some obvious but most necessary corrections.

² *Maluimus optima fide, quorum res fuerant* (so W. corrects 'respuerant' of the Parisian MSS) *eorum etiam verba servare*.

³ *Copia rerum, quam plerique omnes litteratores pedibus inlotis praetereunt, tamquam nihil ultra verborum explanationem liceat nosse* grammatico Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1, 24, 12. Even in the time of Macrobius the pupils of the grammaticus had no copies of Vergil of their own: *videris enim mihi ita adhuc Vergilianos habere versus, qualiter eos pueri magistris praelegentibus canebamus*. Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 24, 5. Both the work of Donatus as well as, and even in a much higher degree, that of Servius, were written, not for *pueri* but for *magistri*, as well as for the cultured adherents of the older order: this last purpose, as we shall see abundantly further on, was the design and the very *raison d'être* of much in Servius particularly.

the Antonines, there do not seem to have been. At least none, that *we* would consider as such, unless there be those among us who would reverently enter into the 'adyta sacri poematis' (Macrob. Sat. 1, 24, 11) in the spirit of Symmachus, Praetextatus and Servius.

What then, we ask, is the spirit which reveals itself in the citations which Servius makes of Donatus?

(We may as well state here that Servius wrote his commentary on the Aeneid first, and that his work on Bucolics and Georgics followed, in the order named: the revelation of the best and most characteristic work of Servius must be sought in the first and greatest of his labors.) But I will let Servius speak directly: Aen. 2, 557, 'Tacet ingens litore truncus': . . . quod autem Donatus dicit, 'litus' locum esse ante aras, a litando dictum . . . *ratione caret*; nam a litando 'li' brevis est, et stare non potest versus. Clearly a blunder of Donatus. Did D. transcribe here, too? We do not know. Perhaps Servius, with a deliberation not very rare in the scholar's profession, named Donatus chiefly where the latter's hand had blundered: thus in 2, 798 where, for *exilio* Donatus proposed *ex Ilío*: D. contra metrum sensit, dicens 'ex Ilío' quasi de Ilío: nam longa est. Of the invulnerable character of the Harpies (Aen. 3, 242): quod Donatus dicit, ideo eas fuisse invulnerabiles, quia de Styge erant natae, *non probatur*. On the eye of Polyphemus 3, 636: nam *male sentit* Donatus dicens 'late patebat' contra metrum. Again 6, 339 'effusus in undis' archaismos est (i. e. for: in undas): quamquam Donatus esse ordinem velit 'dum servat sidera in undis mediis'. In 6, 535 after giving his own explanation Servius adds: Donatus tamen dicit Auroram cum quadrigis positam Solem significare. Servius in his note on 6, 623, vetitosque hymenaeos is positively captious: unde Donatus *male ait* 'natura et legibus vetitos'. Why not, indeed? In 7, 1 he rejects the explanation of Donatus. In 7, 543 he disagrees with his nearest predecessor (even when Donatus was buttressed by the authority of Probus and Asper), although in a somewhat more modest manner: *potest* tamen esse epexegetis ed.: 7, 563 unde etiam Donatus dicit Lucaniae esse qui describitur locus, circa fluvium qui Calor vocatur: quod ideo non procedit, quia ait *Italiae medio*. In 8, 333 Donatus read *pelagi* as a locative, not a genitive . . . clearly wrong, although Servius here abstains.

The application of Venus to Vulcan (8, 373) to make new armour for her son Aeneas—her son by an illicit amour, too, was one of the gravest faults¹ of Vergil's economy, according to the main trend of exegesis. Servius stands by the poet. Exactly as in Homer, so here much ingenuity was consumed in getting up an interpretation that maintained absolute moral and logical congruity. Servius here very properly disagreed with his predecessor: *nam quod dicit Donatus potuisse fieri ut cum Anchisa concumberet Venus, ante quam Vulcano nuberet, non procedit.*

In 9, 361: *post mortem . . . whose death?*² Donatus says: of Nisus and Euryalus; and Servius properly rejects this forced solution of one of the famous twelve insoluble passages of the Aeneid: *quod non procedit si diligenter advertas.*

Again, in 9, 544 of the death of a warrior who was born of a king and of a slave girl—*quem serva Licymnia furtim sustulerat vetitisque ad Troiam miserat armis*, why *vetitis*? *secundum Donatum 'vetitis fato' . . . sed melius lege militari intellegimus, quia servi a militia prohibebantur. . . .*

Further on in this same book, 9, 672 on *porta commissa*: Here the faultfinding desire betrayed Servius into a note which Conington justly calls a fancy; viz., to read *commissa* as = *clausa*, not *credita*. Mnestheus and Serestus, Servius says, were commanders here, not Pandarus and Bitias: *unde apparet quia hunc locum male intellexit Donatus, dicens, commissam esse portam id est creditam, Pandaro et Bitiae: qui duces non erant. Cornutus vere et melius sensit, dicens, etc.* Servius here, I say, is tempted by his fondness for picking flaws in Donatus to adopt a fanciful explanation. Further the passage clearly shows that Servius had always before him, and quite apart from the extracts made by Donatus, the commentaries of Vergilian editors, in full.

¹Qui enim moriens poema suum legavit igni quid nisi famae suae vulnera posteritati subtrahenda curavit? nec immerito. Erubuit quippe de se futura indicia, si legeretur precatio deae precantis filio arma a marito cui soli nupserat nec ex eo prolem se suscepisse se noverat, vel si mille alia pudenda seu in verbis modo graecis modo barbaris seu in ipsa dispositione operis deprehenderentur. This in Macrobian Sat. I, 24, 6-7. This, however, is spoken in character. Euangelus is throughout presented in the Saturnalia as the *citricaster* and free lance, but little in harmony with the pious reverence and dogmatic awe which animates the greater part of that company.

²Ribbeck brackets: but the testimony of the 12 insoluble verses itself speaks for the genuineness of the line as well as for the unfinished character of the work left by Vergil, immature—left against his will.

But I must content myself with mere citation of the further references: 9, 760; 10, 331; 463; 497; 11, 31; 124 (*frustra ait Donatus*); 316 (*erravit*); 318 (*superfluum*); 762; 12, 365 (*sciendum hoc loco errasse Donatum, etc.*); 366 (*male ait Donatus montem esse*); 507; 514 (*hoc non procedit*); 529 (*superfluum est quod ait Donatus*); 585.

Clearly then Servius thus asserted himself against that work (written for young grammatici) which was in current esteem when Servius came forward.

Further, Servius is named among the correspondents of Symmachus. Otto Seeck, the learned editor of Symmachus,¹ assigns letter no. 60 in Book 8 to the year 396 A. D., and says on p. cxcix in his *Chronologia Symmachiana*: Servius fortasse a Mario Servio Honorato, Vergilii interprete, non diversus erat hunc enim Symmachi familiaritate usum esse, ex Macrobiani Saturnalibus perspicitur. In fact the assumption of two Vergilian Servii for the generation of St. Ambrose and Symmachus, this notion of Nettleship is, in my opinion quite untenable, and becomes quite frail the more we examine the data of tradition.

Now, further, was our Servius a mere man of learning, a mere student of classic literature, or was he not also one to whom the old order of Roman ritual, of the old culture, of certain forms of Greek philosophy were dear and precious? Is there any regard for the times of Theodosius?

It was a time of transition. On the whole the pagan Romans, who abounded particularly among the aristocracy, could not complain as to certain remnants, ritual and worship. Even at the time 384 A. D., in which Symmachus as praefectus urbis had made his famous *relatio*, Ambrose² said, in addressing Valentinian directly: *templa gentilium muneribus onerasti*. . . . Further, ib. the bishop of Milan refers to the Roman Senate thus: in *communi illo Christianorum gentiliumque concilio*. Haruspices still practice their profession (*Epist. Ambros. 82, 16*). There are more Christians in the Senate than gentiles (*ib. § 31*). In all temples are there altars, an altar even in the temple of the

¹ A. Aurelii Symmachi Quae Supersunt edidit Otto Seeck, Berolini Apud Weidmannos 1883.

² St. Ambrose, *Epistulae* No. 68 Migne.

Victories (ib.). Is not Symmachus satisfied with having the *simulacra* of the ancient gods everywhere, in the baths, in the porticoes, in the streets?

The most curious feature of that last struggle of the ancient cult and culture too with the spirit of Christianity was this: to combine the lofty flights, and the undeniable elements of a noble spirituality as it was presented in the Platonism¹ and Pythagorism of that time with the observance of traditional rite and ritual.

And this characteristic attitude—the Germans would call it *Zwitterstellung*—I find revealed in Servius, too. And first as to rite and ritual. Vergil was a veritable storehouse, and even when he was not, the fervor of the old cult interpreted into him whatever was needed. Varro was the universal author of reference, although Nigidius Figulus ranked close to him. Much of the present tense in citations is due to the fact of citation. Time and again Servius goes into and brings forward the precious matter of Varro, far beyond the exegetical needs of the passage and beyond the elucidation of his *lemma*. The word *theologia*, and the *theologi* as a definite class of writers and authorities, recur a great deal both in Servius as well as in Macrobius.

So even Varro, as the great antiquarian authority, is ranked; e. g., Aen. 10, 175 (on divination): Nigidius Figulus autem solus est post Varronem, *licet Varro praeceat in theologia*, hic in communibus litteris: nam uterque utrumque scripserunt. Thus Varro, who in his own person seems to have followed the allegorizing rationalism of his Stoic teachers and sources, could be classed with Orpheus and the Orphica, with Hesiod, or with Zeno, Kleantes and Chrysippus, for that matter.

Servius everywhere seems to have recorded and preserved the old myths and legends with remarkable fulness and great detail, without believing them, or in them, at all; it is the interpretation thereof which contains the precious truth. To illustrate: Aen. 1, 743: *Unde hominum genus: si fabulam respicis*, a Prometheo intellege, vel a Deucalione et Pyrrha; *si autem veritatem respicis*, varia est opinio philosophorum.

¹ We say Neoplatonism, from our point of view. But Macrobius; e. g., (the most fervid of them all in his time and generation, in our tradition) speaks of *Platonici*, *Platonica secta*, *diversi sectatoris Platonis*: Plotinus inter philosophiae professores cum Platone princeps, Somn. Scip. 1, 8, 8. It must be admitted that the Neoplatonists took Plato much more seriously, in a dogmatic and transcendental way, than did the Academy of Athens, Old, Middle and New.

Iuno and Aeolus, Aen. 1, 78: rediit ad physicam rationem, nam motus aëris, id est Iunonis, ventos creat, quibus Aeolus praeest. On Ceres: Aen. 1, 306: unde et *alma Ceres*, quod nos alat; nam physici dicunt omnia per diem crescere; or again Aen. 2, 610 *Neptunus muros* hoc quidem habet fabula, quod Neptunus cum Apolline Troiae fabricati sunt muros. Sed constat etc.; i. e., Laomedon used certain funds which he had vowed, to build walls with, instead. Interdum pro aëre Iuno, pro aethere Iuppiter ponitur, Georg. 2, 325; aliquoties et pro aëre et pro aethere Iuppiter, ib. Like all didactic people he iterates his phrase in such matters. Kronos (Saturn) emasculating Uranos (Caelus) Georg. 2, 406: *quod ideo fingitur, quia*, nisi umor de caelo in terras descenderit, nihil creatur. The ivory shoulder of Pelops: (Georg. 3, 7) *quod ideo fingitur, quia* Ceres ipsa est terra, quae corpora universa consumit, ossa tantum reservans. The expounding of *Pan* on Buc. 2, 31 reads almost like a reminiscence from Cornutus c. 27. Athena sprung from head of Zeus: sed *quia* dea est artium et ingenii, *ideo ista finguntur* (Buc. 2, 61).

So too Prometheus and Caucasus, etc. (Bucol. 6, 42)—a mixture of Euhemerism and Stoic lore. Oracles from doves in Epirus: *quod ideo fingitur, quia* lingua Thessala *phēiades* et columbae et vaticinatrices vocantur (Buc. 9, 13). The eagle of Zeus who furnished the thunderbolts against the Gigantes: *quod ideo fingitur, quia* per naturam nimii est caloris, adeo ut etiam ova quibus supersidet possit coquere (Aen. 1, 394). So frail and transparent is everything that one marvels as to what could remain in these symbolisms that could really be brought into any connection with religion at all. One more illustration must suffice: (Aen. 4, 201): *Excubias Divum Aeternas* definitio est aeterni ignis. Quid est ignis pervigil? excubiae deorum, et sciendum *non vacare ratione*, ut in aliquibus templis sit ignis pervigil: nam potestates aut terrenae sunt, aut aerae, aut aetheriae; sed quia aether ignis est, ideo in aetheriarum potestatum templis ignis est, ut reddatur eis imago sui elementi, est autem in templo Iovis, qui aether est et Minervae, quae supra aethera est: unde de patris capite procreata esse dicitur.—An eruditional attitude, then, in the main.

As for the question of the actualities of the old ritual and worship in Rome in his time there is some evidence. The word 'Christian' indeed cannot be discovered in the Servius which we have, and still some curtailing and some evanescence of religious

usages seems tangible here and there. Aen. 7, 397: sicut in Liberalibus *fiebat*. Bucol. 3, 76: causa natalis diei in cuius tantum sacrificio *licebat* voluptatibus operam dare; nam in aliis sacrificiis *erat* castitatis observatio, quas praesentia sua pontifices . . . *celebrabant*, Georg. I, 344.¹ Now the system of Neoplatonism had reserved a place, not a high place but still a place, for these *numina* of old. God indeed, the First or Primal Essence is above all, but man² must not pass over the intermediate emanations which conduct him to the higher one: besides the Primal Essence he must worship Νοῦς and the Soul of the World, the visible gods and the demons. . . . All are entitled to worship, which becomes less material and more purely intellectual or intuitive as we rise from the lowest emanations upward. It was the time of *θεοκρασία*: Osiris and Isis, Serapis and Apollo, all were more or less identified and in many interpretations finally merged in the Sun.

So too our Servius (Aen. 6, 859) identifies Quirinus and Mars; Hercules and Mars (Aen. 8, 275 nam et stellam unam habere dicuntur). Numenius, Plotinus, Porphyry, Iamblichus: all were from the East, and they were active in this process of simplification and identification, this fusion of gods and legends, this furnishing of a broader basis to the cult of *simulacra* and ἀγάλματα.

There was such a trend even in the mythological treatises of the Stoics who now gained a new period of study and of acceptance. Et sciendum, says Servius (Aen. 4, 638), Stoicos dicere unum esse deum, cui nomina variantur pro actibus et officiis; unde etiam duplicis sexus numina esse dicuntur, ut, cum in actu, mares sint, feminae, cum patiendi habent naturam . . . etc. So the Stoici in that era of Servius and Symmachus and Praetextatus were classified as *physici*.

Vergil as a bearer of philosophy or of philosophical erudition: here there is a broad difference between the scholar Servius, and between Macrobius. The latter with a fervid intensity which is all his own, claims for the national Roman poet a veritable omniscience and universality comparable only to the attitude which the members of the Saturnalian dinner parties (with a few

¹ On lupercal: spelunca (Aen. 8, 343), in qua de capro *luebatur*, id est *sacrificabatur*.

² Zeller, Philos. d. Griechen 3, 2. Third edition, 1881, p. 669.

exceptions) bestowed on Homer himself. To Symmachus and his friends then Vergil was a veritable book of revelation: Maro omnium disciplinarum peritus (Macrob. Sat. 1, 16, 12): Homerus vester Mantuanus (1, 16, 43) Vergilius sciens Liberum patrem Solem esse, et Cererem Lunam (1, 18, 23) haec est . . . Maronis gloria, ut nullius laudibus crescat, nullius vituperatione minuatur (1, 24, 8). Astrologia totaque philosophia (1, 24, 18), poeta tam scientia profundus quam amoenus ingenio (3, 2, 10), suo more, velut aliud *agendo*¹ implet *arcana* (3, 4, 6), idque non mortali sed divino ingenio praevidisse (5, 1, 18), Homericae per omnia perfectionis imitator Maro (Somn. Scip. 1, 7, 7), poeta naturae ipsius conscius (Som. 1, 16, 5).

Servius, I say is more cool and sober; i. e., in his estimation of the philosophical strains, ideas, notions, allusions, in Vergil, than is Macrobius.

He is perfectly aware of the fact that Vergil, in Aen. VI has not been himself converted to Platonism. With unflagging industry Servius notes whether here Vergil 'follows' the Epicureans, or there the Stoics, or elsewhere again, the Pythagoreans, even in a slight phrase. Servius treats Vergil as one who was grounded on Epicureanism, a pupil of Siro, and holds that, in the Inferno, Bk. VI, the Roman poet merely resorted to metempsychosis as a device which would enable him to introduce a prospective survey of Roman greatness and grandees; v. especially on Aen. 6, 752: ante dicta de reversione animarum probatio huc tetendit, ut celebret Romanos et praecipue Augustum . . . *au reste* Servius says of Vergil himself (Aen. 6, 264): Sciens ergo de deorum imperio varias esse opiniones, prudentissime tenuit generalitatem. Ex maiore autem parte Sironem, id est magistrum suum Epicureum sequitur; *huius autem sectae homines novimus superficiem rerum tractare, nunquam altiora disquirere*.² There is some scorn here, some valuation too of the loftier things to which those materialists did not aspire. Clearly Servius himself treasures these *altiora*.³

¹ For *agens*. This crowding of the gerund on the participle is one of the earmarks of the Latinity of Macrobius and of Servius. Thus the latter almost uniformly says *dicendo* for *dicens* of earlier latinity.

² Hoc autem de animis etiam Lucretius adserit, *sed non tam veritati studet, quam sectae Epicureae*. Aen. 5, 81.

³ Ubertate doctrinae *altioris*, Macrob. Sat. 3, 12, 5: Multa per *altam* scientiam philosophorum, theologorum, Aegyptiorum, etc. Servius in the introduction of his commentary on Aen. VI.

And now let us see what these were to him. It is quite clear to the student of Servius that he is a Platonist or as we say a Neoplatonist, also that the doctrine of the Spheres and other Pythagorean lore, long incorporated with Platonism, were held by Servius as a personal matter of serious conviction, and not merely as a curiosity of erudition.

Plotinus is not quoted very often in Servius, but he does appear; e. g., in Aen. 9, 182: Apud Plotinum philosophum et alios quaeritur, utrum mentis nostrae acies per se ad cupiditates et consilia moveatur, an impulsu alicuius numinis? et primo dixerunt mentes humanas moveri sua sponte; deprehenderunt tamen ad omnia honesta impelli nos genio et *numine quodam familiari*, quod nobis nascentibus datur, etc. Possibly here Servius has in mind the Platonic doctrine set forth by Plotinus in Enneades 3, 4: *περὶ τοῦ εἰληχότος ἡμᾶς δαίμονος*.

But the character of these studies will, I trust, permit me to abstain from any attempt to rebuild the system, or construct any exhaustive survey of it, out of Servius. Enough, however, will be presented to characterize his deepest convictions.

(Dido) 'excuses (Aen. 4, 653, 'vixi') the snapping short of life *because* Plato says that with a great penalty are visited the souls of those who leave life before the time'.

Ib. Not Nature but Fate. For by three things is human life limited: by *nature*, to which not more than one hundred and twenty solar years are granted; by *fate*, for which ninety years, that is, three courses of Saturn, cause destruction, unless perchance the kindliness of other stars¹ overcomes even its third course; by *fortune*; i. e., by chance, which has to do with all things which are beyond ourselves (extrinsecus, τὰ ἕξω, Stoic phrase?) . . .

Similarly, of influence of constellations (Aen. VI 129): quos diligit Iuppiter, hoc est, quos in ortu benignus siderum aspectus inradiat.

Again: What indeed is that portion of ourselves (Aen. 4, 654) which goes to the Lower World? "For we consist of three things, of soul which is from above (superna est) and seeks its origin; the body, which gives out on earth; the shade, which Lucretius thus defines, etc. 'And (Aen. VI 136) under the image of myths she (i. e. the Sibyl) teaches the straightest road,

¹ ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἥλιος θεός, ὅτι ἐμψυχός, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἀστρα· Plotinus, Enn. 5, 1 2.

through which return to heaven (ad superos) is granted to souls'..... 'We know (novimus) that Pythagoras of Samos divided the life of man in the fashion of the letter Y, namely, because the first period of life is indefinite, because it has not as yet given itself over to vices nor to virtues: but that the bifurcation of the letter Y begins with youth, at which time men follow either vices, that is the left part, or virtues, that is the right part?'...

Incarnation, according to the doctrine of the school: diis autem geniti (Aen. VI 129), quia corporibus se infundebant¹ potestates supernae, unde heroës procreabantur.

Still, with all his undeniable and broad learning, differing as he does from the dogmatic fervor of his fellow-disciple Macrobius, our Vergilian commentator here and there in his exegesis is positively carried away by his Neoplatonism. I find a clear case in VI 129 sqq.

Pauci, quos aequus amavit
Iuppiter, aut ardens exexit ad aethera virtus,
Dis geniti, potuere.

Clearly Vergil thinks of types such as Herakles, as Dionysos, but Servius: *quos prudentia* (he means philosophia) *sublevat*.² He has in mind that approximation to *the One* and to *the First*, which is particularly reserved for the philosopher of Platonism.

To this we may add a passage from the note on VI 127 because the *doctrine of the Spheres* is embraced there also: ergo hanc terram in qua vivimus, inferos esse voluerunt, quia est omnium circulorum infima, planetarum scilicet septem, Saturni, Iovis, Martis, Solis, Veneris, Mercurii, Lunae et duorum magnorum..... Ergo omnia quae de inferis finguntur, suis locis *hic* esse comprobabimus. And in Aen. 2, 25: Nam circuli septem sunt, Saturni, Iovis, Martis, Solis, Veneris, Mercurii, Lunae. Et primus, hoc est Saturni, vehementer sonat, reliqui secundum ordinem minus, sicut audimus in cithara. Ergo (sic) *tacita* luna est, cuius circulus, terrae vicinus immobili, minus sonat aliorum comparatione. It is obviously quite doubtful whether the slowly composing master of the villa on the Posilipo, continually leaped in and out of such doctrinal purpose, and Servius, as exegetes

¹ οὕτω τοι καὶ ψυχὴ ἐλθοῦσα εἰς σῶμα κ. τ. λ. Plotinus, Enn. V 1, 2.

² ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχέτυπον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀληθινώτερον ἀναβὰς κάκει πάντα ἰδέτω νοητὰ καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ αἰδία. Plotinus, Enn. V 1, 4.

will do, reveals *himself* rather than his author, reveals, I say, the times which Heinrich Ritter (Hist. of Ancient Philosophy, last vol. Engl. version, p. 634) admirably sketches: The diligence which the pagans now showed in the preservation of ancient literature in general; which appeared to the philosophers as the appropriate means for maintaining the divine revelations in their purity, and giving a becoming exposition of them. In these efforts, moreover, the Greeks and Romans were in no slight degree animated by a devotion to ancestral institutions and a pride in the olden renown of their state¹ and people, all of which seemed to be endangered by the new religion.

But I must address myself to bringing this section to a conclusion. I will therefore content myself with a mere enumeration of further points of Neoplatonic doctrine.

The forms of Soul: anima vitalis, a. sensualis, intellectualis, and that of plant-life,² four grades in all (Aen. 5, 81): Elysian fields in lunar sphere (Aen. 6, 638); Eternity of Soul (6, 727); different lot of souls after death (Aen. 6, 745). The *First* and *the One*: invocat autem Summum Bonum, quod in silentio constare manifestum est (Aen. 6, 264). The enormous note on metempsychosis (Aen. 6, 724).

Reincarnation of Souls (Aen. 6, 703). To these references I add a few from the notes on the minor poems: ex insertis *altioribus rebus*, Bucol. praef., harmoniam caeli, in qua septem soni sunt, ib; novimus autem eandem esse Proserpinam quam Dianam 3, 26; qui summos circulos et caeli secreta conscendit 5, 57; sed constat secundum *Porphyrii* librum, quem solem appellat, triplicem esse Apollinis potestatem, et eundem esse Solem apud Superos, Liberum Patrem in terris, Apollinem apud inferos (Buc. 5, 66). Add the note on 'numero deus impare gaudet' (8, 75); facie rubra pingitur Pan propter aetheris similitudinem: aether

¹ Illa quippe saecula sunt, quae hoc imperium vel sanguine vel sudore pepererunt, Macrobi. Sat. 3, 14, 2.

² Here clearly the MSS of Servius should be changed from *φυσική* to *φυτική*: esse etiam quartam infra omnes, quae *φυτική* (MSS *φυσική*) vocatur . . . ut est in herbis et arboribus. The copyists of Servius in Italy in the XV and even more in the preceding centuries knew but very little Greek indeed. Cf. also Plotinus Enn. 3, 4, 2: διὸ φεύγειν δεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἄνω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τὴν αἰσθητικὴν ἐπακολουθοῦντες τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς εἰδώλοισι, μηδὲ εἰς τὴν φυτικὴν, etc., etc., ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ νοερόν καὶ νοῦν καὶ θεὸν θέωμεν. Add Macrobius Somn. Scip. 1, 14, 7: λογικόν, αἰσθητικόν, φυτικόν.

autem est Iuppiter (10, 27); quod dicerent philosophi, recedentes hinc animas illic alia corpora sortiri 1, 243. Add 4, 399.

A little above the name of Porphyry occurred to us: And is it not obvious that the numerous works of Porphyry dealing with Homer and with Homeric exegesis¹ should have been studied and treasured by Neoplatonists such as were Servius and Macrobius. There is, e. g., the overwhelming almost literal identity of the whole manner in which myths and mythical matters are expounded—identity or strong resemblance, I say between Porphyry and Servius. Cf. on Homer Il. A, 399 (the binding of Zeus): *δεῖ τοίνυν φυσικόν τινα μᾶλλον ἐν τούτοις ὑπονοεῖν λόγον. Δία γάρ φησι τὴν ἄκρατον θερμασίαν, τὴν καὶ τὸ ζῆν καὶ τοῦ εἶναι ἡμᾶς αἰτίαν, ἥραν τὸν ἄερα, κ. τ. έ.*

Again, from Porphyry's *de Abstinentia* ed. Nauck, 1860, e. g., p. 178. *τῆς δὲ Φερρεφάττης παρὰ τὸ φέρβειν τὴν φάτταν φασὶν οἱ πολλοὶ τοῦνομα τῶν θεολόγων.* It is the same theory, the same exegetical procedure.

II.

It remains for me to say something of Servius as a grammaticus and rhetor.

But the bristling, teeming, mass of data is before me: how can I serve the readers of this Journal? Clearly only in one way, that is in proceeding to an election. I therefore beg to offer some survey of three things.

1. The data furnished by Valerius Probus.
2. The technical terms of grammatico-rhetorical nomenclature.
3. The injection of Rhetorical Theory into the appreciation of Vergil.

I.

One might perhaps say that there is nothing to be added to the exposition of Nettleship (*The Ancient Commentators on Vergil LXIV–LXVIII*). The keen and sober manner of Nettleship in arriving at conclusions is familiar to students of Vergil and of the tradition of the Latin grammatici. But still there is, I believe, some aftermath in our Servius.

Servius read Probus' own copy of Vergil which was accessible in some library at Rome: Probus ranked foremost as a literary scholar among all the grammatici who gained renown in the

¹Schrader, *Porphyrii Quaestiones Homericae ad Iliadem pertinentem reliquiae*, Lipsiae, 1880, p. 2, II ad Odysam, p. 2, 189.

profession: with him, or near him there ranked but one other name, that of Terentius Scaurus,¹ comparable to the renown of Aristarchus and of Zenodotus.

As Suetonius (De Grammaticis 24) tells, Probus wrote no *ars*: What then made him so famous? 'multaque exemplaria contracta *emendare ac distinguere et adnotare* curavit. As we learn (Reifferscheidt, p. 138) from Suetonius, Probus applied the critical symbols of Aristarchus to the settling of the text of Roman authors such as Vergil, Horace, Lucretius. Still his chief aim was the study of the pre-classical authors: Suetonius (Gram. 29) emphasizes his persistence in this archaic criticism, non-productive though it was of fame or fortune. He found it not easy even to secure MSS—*hos cum diligentius repeteret*—they were almost lost or forgotten: *atque alios deinceps cognoscere cuperet*, etc.; we may think of Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, Lucilius, Pacuvius, Accius, Terence, Caecilius and the like. I am quite positive that no one of the later grammatici rivalled or equalled him in this familiarity with the *veteres*.

What made Probus so positive that he claimed to know the precise way in which Plautus and Ennius pronounced certain words (Gell. 4, 7, 1), scil. Hannibâlem, Hamilcârem, Hasdrubâlem. Now this curious *anecdote* of Gellius' is significant in another way: Probus insisted on practicing this pronunciation *himself*, insisted on opposing the actual pronunciation which prevailed all around him. To such an extent was he steeped in, and soaked with, the *sermo antiquus*.² That 'silva observationum sermonis antiqui'. What was it?

Is it not exceedingly probable, that he appended parallels of diction, phrase, vocabulary, to those MSS which he traversed critically? Did he not thus add to his copy of Vergil, e. g.? Teuffel in dealing with Probus on Vergil, is content to copy the assumptions of Steup (Tffl. Litt. G. 300, 3): The allusions to Probus in Charisius, Diomedes, *Servius* and Priscian are doubtless *all at third hand*, probably due to the commentary of Flavius Caper. As for *Servius*, doubtless they are due to that direct and eager study, which made him and his fellows and co-religionists

¹ Et nomen grammatici merui non tam grande quidem, quo gloria nostra subiret, Aemilium aut Scaurum, Berytiumve Probum. Ausonius ed. Peiper, p. 2; also p. 63: Scaurum Probumque corde callens intimo; also p. 66.

² Possibly Quintilian had Probus in mind when he wrote X 1, 43: nam *quidam* solos veteres legendos putant, etc., etc.

ransack the libraries with anxious industry and consuming interest. And I have no hesitation in claiming that they were made *at first hand* as were those to Varro; e. g., direct reading, citation of authors who were indeed authorities, this was the very *fad* even, if I may say so, among the Romans led by Praetextatus and Symmachus.¹ In those circles hard reading and direct quotation were positively demanded. The more *antiquus* or *vetustus* an author was the greater his authority there. And so too the Servius of Macrobius cites Verrius Flaccus 1, 4, 7; Asinius Pollio, 1, 4, 12; Varro, 1, 4, 14; Ennius, 1, 4, 17; Claudius Quadrigarius, 1, 4, 18; the Twelve Tables, 1, 4, 19, etc. But to return to Probus. Servius says on Aen. 1, 21: in Probi (scil. exemplari Vergillii Aeneidis) adpuncti sunt (scil. *obelo*) et adnotatum: hi duo si eximantur, nihilo minus sensus integer est. In 1, 44 ('*transfixo pectore*') Probus read *tempore*. In 3, 3 Probus proposed *fumâ't* = *fumâvit* syncopated. Frequently Probus quite fearlessly challenges, if I may so put it, the very Latinity of Vergil; as, 3, 83, 'iungimus hospitio dextras', or on 4, 359, 'nemo *haurit* vocem'. 'Adnotavit' also we read of, Probus, 4, 418. Close, it seems, was the consultation extended to Probus.

I would like to ask whence Servius derived the parallels of older latinity; e. g., on *colere* of an inferior by a superior: (Plautus in Poenulo) 1, 16; or, 1, 140: quod autem dixit 'saxa immania, vestras domos' de Pseudolo Plauti tractum est etc.; 1, 191, for a use of *turba*, Cicero Verrines, and Plautus Amphitruo are cited; 1, 233, *ob* Italiam = juxta: Plautus in Milite and Terence, are cited for this; 1, 378 on *pius* = religiosus, parallels from Sallust and Plautus; 1, 435 (ignavum pecus: Plautus *clurinum* *pecus* simiam dixit; or was there such vigorous reading of Plautus still practiced by the grammatici? The name of Probus is never mentioned in these parallels; cf. also I 480, 543, 636, 703, 724, 738; II 51, 62, 206, 357; III 42 *scelerare* polluere: et est sermo Plautinus quo hodie non utimur. Even more abundant than to the usage of Plautus are the references to that of *Terence*. There are a few to Afranius, about twenty-three to Lucilius, to

¹ Cum omnes quasi vetustatis promptuarium Albinus memoriam laudavissent, Macrobius Sat. 1, 4, 1. At Vettius' the company meets in his library 1, 6, 1; vir plurimae lectionis 3, 6, 7; repperi 3, 9, 6 sq.; quod mihi *magistra lectione* compertum est, publicabo, 3, 11, 5; quae tibi memoria crebrae lectionis occurrunt, 3, 18, 1; ex *antiquiorum* lectione, 6, 1, 2; etc., etc.

Naevius about eight ; to Ennius, about sixty-eight. Still it would be rash to say that Servius owed this matter to Probus alone, or particularly, even. It is more likely that here too we come upon that ransacking of libraries and that renewal of older reading far beyond the beaten path of the needs of the grammaticus.

I must append here a note as to the personal manner of Servius. Scaliger presumes much condensation of S. by the mediaeval copyists. On the other hand Servius' personal usage and didactic phrase seems to have been quite well preserved. Here there stands forth the phrase *lectum est* (or *legitur*), as the formula of citation and, we may add, demonstration of authority. E. g., *lectum est* in naturali historia Plinii 1, 174 ; l. e. in historia Poenorum et in Livio 1, 343 ; *licet* in Sallustio l. sit 1, 380 ; in ornithogonia 1, 393 ; in artibus, 1, 535 ; *ut* in Bacchidibus (of Eurip.) l. e. 2, 13 ; in tragoedia *legitur* 2, 20 ; *habemus* in Livio II 148 ; de morte Priami varie l. e. 2, 506 ; *licet* in historia *lectum sit* 2, 615 ; in Petronio 3, 57 ; apud chorographos 3, 104 ; sicut in rhetoricis legimus 4, 284 ; de Anna et Aenea, apud Varronem : et *licet* . . . plurimum tempus intersit, *lectum tamen est* ; quod nusquam *lectum est* 5, 822 ; nusquam legimus 6, 529 ; *lectum est* in philologis 7, 1 ; in iure *lectum est* 7, 38 ; *lectum non est* 7, 231 ; omnis lectio docet 8, 638 ; in Pindaro *lectum est tantum* 10, 312 ; *lectum est* in disciplina militari 10, 428 ; usquam l. e. 12, 514 ; *frenum* raro *lectum est* 12, 568.

2.

The simplest way to present Servius as grammaticus and rhetor would be to present an index prepared for this paper, out of the text of Thilo, of his technical nomenclature. The figures are from the Aeneid.

ab eo quod est (ἀπὸ τοῦ) I 20 ; 95 ; 185 ; 428 ; 480 ; 537 ; II 145.
absolute I 494 ; IV 184 ; V 108.

abusive I 43 ; 400 ; 466 ; 543 ; 607 ; III 357, 438 ; IV 495 ; 543 ; V 682 ; 721 ; VI 299 ; VII 282 ; IX 175 ; X 23 ; 24 ; opp. *proprie* XI 644 ; *abusus* I 433 ; *abutitur* I 194 ; *καταχρηστικῶς* I 260 ; 577 ; II 379 ; *κατάχρησις* VII 164.

acyrologia I 198 ; II 628 ; III 226 ; IV 419 ; VII 622 ; 804.

amphibolia III 398 ; IV 371 ; VII 637 ; VIII 76 ; 299 ; ἀμφιβολία II 31 ; ἀμφιβολικῶς I 267 ; *amphibolon* I 492 ; III 711 ; IV 178 ; V 439.

- ἀνακλόουθον III 478; 541; V 66; 281.
antapodosis (decima) IX 452.
 ἀντικατηγορία X 36.
antiphrasis I, 139; ἀντίφρασις I 22; III 63; VI 299.
antiptosis I 120; 573; 734; V 609; VI 727.
antiqui I 12; 147; antique IV 575; VI 468; IX 399; X 807;
 XII 263; vetuste IV 244; XII 517.
antistoechon I 421; antistoichon I 726.
antonomasia I 23; VII 115; antonomasivum II 171; 615; III
 251; IV 276; X 668.
aphaeresis I 59; 203; 542; 665; III 50; IV 16; XII 285; 372.
apocope I 156; II 661.
aposiopesis II 100; 105; ἀποσιώπησις I 135.
archaismos I 3; 23; II 541; IV 98; X 387; XI 686; XII 316.
apostropha II 56; V 123; XII 503.
asyrde-ton X 659.
 αὐξησις IV 569.
cacemphaton I 193; cacemphatos sensus VIII 406.
cacosyntheton IX 606.
celeuma III 128 (Cretam proavosque petamus).
comparatio II 223; 496; IV 402.
 δεικτικῶς I 672; II 289; III 45; XI 115; 734; XII 176;
 dicticῶς I 106.
 δημοκρατικῶς I 21.
derivatio I 686.
diasyrctice II 142; oratio diasyrctica II 80; inrisorie III 272.
dilemma, id est complexio quae adversarium ab utraque parte
 concludit II 675.
diminutive I 256.
diphthongos I 697.
distinguere (to punctuate) I 475, 548, 607; II 149, 156; 274,
 294, 394, 705; III 145, 379; IV 660; V 81.
ectasis I 343; X 473.
ellipsis I 65; IV 598; eclipsis IX 51.
elocutio (expression, phrase) I 47; honesta 147; reciproca
 409; bona II 135; nota 765; soluta III 173; cf. IV 234;
 373; 494, 536; VII 541; VIII 107, 114, 509; IX 60, 63,
 166, 272; X 94; vitiosa 586.
emphasis I 37; II 394; 657; III 201; ἐμφατικῶς II 374; 404,
 643; eloquenter, ἐμφατικῶς IV 103; 440; V 12.
 ἐν δὲ αὖθις V 410; VII 15; XI 22, 571; II 627; III 148; 467.

Epanalepsis II 394.

epenthesis VI 385.

epitheton I 4; 23; 51; 53, 118, 127; proprium 224; 323, 355, 444, 464; II 137, 171; perpetuum 250; 335; 510, 593; III 16, 70, 398; IV 5, 180, 190, 345; V 17, 816; VI 202; VII 31.

exaggeratio a synonymis II 128.

exochê I 740; II 556; κατ' ἐξοχήν III 159.

figura (cf. schema) I 6, 22, 41, 65, 75, 77, 104, 146, 206, 241, 561, 579, 589, 658, 669, 713 (Graeca f. II 407); II 478; III 426; honesta IV 401; V 120, 447, 720; VI 239; VII 184; figurate I 212; III 14, 426, 428; IV 219; VI 435; X 135; XI 76; figuratius IV 529; figuratum II 218; figuratis coloribus V 687; Graeca figura I 320; 328; V 285; VI 313.

homonymum II 333.

hypallage I 9, 392, 518; II 173 (ὑπαλλαγή II 64); II 231, 361, 508; III 62, 362, 418, 424; IV 506; V 137, 458, 507, 589; VI 100, 268, 419, 559; VII 73; VIII 71, 125; IX 529; X 113, 660, 681; XI 18, 458 (= metonymy); XII 187, 340, 621, 690, 739, 859.

hyperbaton (v. ordo) III 662; VII 346; VIII 127; longum h. XII 161.

hyperbole I 119; III 565; 567, 624 (exaggeratio IV 181); IV 211, 298; V 144; IX 599, 697; XII 856; ὑπερβολικῶς II 501; VII 43.

hysterologia II 11; 162; IV 14, 33; IX 813.

hysteroproteron I 78, 179; 264; figura ab eo quod praecedit id quod sequitur II 48; 134; 162, 353, 731; III 300; IV 7, 588; VII 813; VIII 85, 201, 593; IX 70, 83.

ironia VII 190; εἰρωνικῶς 556.

καθ' ὅλον VI 284.

κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ V 21.

κατ' ἐν φημισμὸν I 704.

lexis polysemos IV 231.

litotes I 77, 387, 479; V 39, 809; VII 9, 261; VIII 299, 627; X 907; XI 430.

locutio I 161; l. graeca III 594.

τῶν μέσων I 657; II 106, 140, 165; II 681; IV 91; VII 705; VIII 5, 9, 19; medium XI 344.

metalepsis IX 231.

metaphora II 19; 629; IV 532; VI 1; translatio VI 429.

metonymia III 138.

nove VI 353; VII 477, 490; XII 591.

oeconomia I 170; (prooeconomia I 226); 312; II 298; 620, 681, 733; (dispensat III 19); (prooec. 491); IV 555; V 27, 45; VI 180; IX 1, 267, 466, 715, 757; XI 486, 489, 511; (praestruxisset 593); XII 15, 124, 266.

ὁμοιοτελευτον I 30, 220; II 56; III 663; IV 558; V 391; VIII 435; homoeoteleuton IX 606; X 571; XII 341.

ordo I 53, 65 (servavit ordinem I 76); I 109, 133, 144, 181, 195, 198, 261; ordo autem est longissimus, nam aliter non procedit 'sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli magnanimum Aeneam, tertia dum Latio regnantem viderit aestas, 265; 308, 411, 430, 603; II 40, 128, 143, 220; ordo talis est: invenes, fortissima pectora, frustra succurritis urbi incensae, quia excesserunt omnes dii: unde si vobis cupido certa est, me sequi audentem extrema, moriamur et in media arma ruamus, obscuritatem autem facit hoc loco et *synchysis* id est *hyperbati* longa confusio, et falsa lectio etc. II 348; 355; 384, 535, 738; III 43, 73, 161, 221, 310, 348, 362, 374, 415, 686; IV 105, 174, 211, 393, 520; V 290, 389; est autem *εἰρηός*, id est longissimum hyperbaton, VI 66; 339; *hirmos* est hoc loco, id est, unus sensus protentus per multos versus, 703; VII 120; 346; VIII 15, 174; si ordinaveris, 299; 344; 383; IX 235, 258, 759; X 10, 244, 324, 345, 454, 605, 615, 797, 908; XI 232, 400, 481, 509, 559, 658; XII 64; longum *hyperbaton* 161; 273; 488, 895, 935.

oxymorum VII 295.

parecbasis X 653.

παρέκλον I 207.

parenthesis I 65, 308; II 77; VII 73; IX 693.

periphrasis id est, circumlocutio I 65; 312; III 134; circumlocutio IV 6; 514; V 695; VI 405; VII 120.

perissologia I 658; II 40; V 467; VI 11.

phantasia IV 576.

pleonasmos I 208, 614; II 524; XI 535; pleonasmus IV 359.

poetica licentia I 142, 159; V 553.

πολυσύνητος XI 634.

principalitas I 686

prolepsis IV 42; VI 900.

- pronuntiandum* I 113, 363, 507; III 367; IV 19, 627; IX 56;
 XI 163, 258; XII 577; 800.
proprietas I 410; p. verborum, 435.
prosa X 481.
prosphonesis IV 408.
protentio II 268.
rhetorice (adv.) I 539.
sarcasmos II 547; X 557; XII 359.
scansio III 292.
schema I 135; bonum II 529; IV 233; IX 85; 771.
semiplene loquitur IV 677.
signate III 317; VII 66; 299; 802; VIII 237.
 σιωπόμενον, κατὰ τό I 407; V 282; VI 346; 696.
soloecismus XII 5; soloicophanes I 176; VIII 260; σολοικο-
 φανές IV 355; σολοικοειδές X 10.
 σωματωποιία IV 175.
subaudire I 159, 190, 219, 231, 310, 402; (extrinsecus accipere
 IV 98); IV 109.
syllapsis I 553, 573, 583; V 108; IX 60, 285.
synaeresis II 379; IV 16, 327; VI 104.
synalipha VII 740.
synchysis (cf. ordo, hyperbaton) II 348.
syncope I 26; quae fit, cum de media parte verbi syllaba sub-
 ducitur I 200; 538; II 147.
synecdoche I 724; II 254; VII 159.
synizesis I 332, 353.
systole VI 644.
tapinosis I 118, 465; II 20, 46, 482; II 197; III 624; VIII
 242; X 763; attenuatio 9, 780.
tautologia III 524.
tnesis I 412; II 642; V 440, 603; VI 343; IX 337.
topographia I 159.
topothesia I 159.
translatio (v. metaphora) I 53, 63; (t. reciproca I 92) 149, 224,
 239, 430, 582; II 286 IV 356; VII 572; permansit in
 translatione XII 248.
tropus I 114; II 256.
 ὑπερθεσις V 5.
 ὑπόκρσις X 75.
 ὑφ' ἑν I 198; V 35; hyphen IV 8.
usurpatio (arbitrary writing) I 587; V 233; cf. VII 289; usur-

patum est II 513; VII 188; IV 687; X 63; usurpative (opp. naturaliter) I 121, 458; III 539; XI 522.

veteres I 155, 211.

vetuste I 6, 378.

zeugma I 120; III 133, 260; IX 530; XII 316, 436; XII 576.

We see the technical side of literary scholarship in the classroom of the Latin grammaticus remained what it had been from the beginning, not the child merely of Greek, but the veritable creature of the same. A comparison with the range of Porphyrio on Horace would be interesting, but there is no space here for such.

Whenever Servius strives to give a good equivalent in phrase or term he generally draws on the Greek outright: e. g., 'animis' τοῖς θυμοῖς I 11; colonia ἀποικία I 12; laeti πρόθυμοι I 35; sonoras: ut θάλασσά τε ἡχέεσσα I 53; et graeci φρικτὰ dicunt quae sunt timenda I 92; vada, τὰ βράχια I 112; pronus πρηνής I 115; quod Graeci τρικυμῖαν appellant I 116; hiems χειμῶν I 125. Cymothoë ἀπὸ τοῦ θέειν τὸ κύμα I 144; aëna χάλκεα I 213; virtute τῇ δυνάμει; alibi τῇ βίᾳ I 270, etc. Urbicus at Burdigala was a 'Grammaticus Latinus et Graecus' (Ausonius Peiper, p. 67). And Ausonius, the correspondent of Symmachus, recognizes these further categories in the teacher's profession: Rhetor, Grammaticus, Grammaticus Graecus, Grammaticus Latinus, Philologus Grammaticus et Rhetor, subdoctor, orator (highest honor of all).

3.

That Servius had the attainments of a rhetor I will presently set forth. Of the ancillary and artificial relation which fine literature had to the professional study of rhetoric I need not speak. It began probably with Tisias and Corax. So Homer and all the school classics were analysed to furnish material for the rhetor's τέχνη. In the first lessons came regularly the Homeric description of the different manner of discourse as exhibited by Menelaus and by Odysseus. Il. 3, 212 sqq., ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μύθους καὶ μῆδεα πᾶσιν ὑφαίνον κ. τ. έ., where the scholion: τρεῖς τρόπους ῥητορείας οἶδεν Ὅμηρος, etc., the type of Lysias, of Demosthenes and of Isocrates. For 'copia verborum', and φράσιν facere (Quintil. X 1, 42) was not the only use of literature. And so the somewhat overrated valuations of Quintilian, of Dionysius, of the author περὶ ὑψους all labor from that professional bias.

Thus then we find that Servius is a master of this field, too; he cites two professionals: 'Titianus et Calvus, *qui themata omnia de Vergilio elicuerunt et deformarunt, in exemplo controversiarum*, has duas posuerunt adlocutiones', X 18.

Let me endeavor to cite the rhetorical notes of Servius with some regard for the system, the τέχνη: tria genera dicendi, humile, medium, grandiloquum, Aen. pref., p. 4; humilis character, qui ἰσχυρὸς dicitur, I 701; Venus medio usa est genere loquendi X 60; servavit τὸ πρέπον I 92; 738; III 9; 472; VIII 127; IX 775; XII 443; τῷ πρέποντι IV 170; et hoc principium quidem *acephalon* dicunt I 94; exordium in duo dividitur IV 284; et est rhetorica persuasio, nam principium ab utriusque persona sumpsit VIII 127; solent enim graviora in principiis et in fine secundum artem rhetoricam poni X 38; insinuatione utetur XI 411; bonum principium XII 11; et bene servat circa hunc rhetoricam definitionem orator enim est vir bonus, dicendi peritus I 151; benevolentia in the exordium I 522; est argumentum ab impossibili I 223; argumentum ab impossibili I 529; *loci* of laudatio I 606; commendat ex loci difficultate I 647; utile II 289; honestum 291; possibile 294; a tempore: ab invitis diis II 638; laus a maioribus, l. a. cognatione II 787; excusatio a voluntate III 25; argumentum a facili III 116; a. a necessitate III 161; a necessario et utili III 188; rhetorica esse argumenta, quae a contrariis laudant III 476; a verisimili IV 352; declamavit per contrarium IV 373; vituperatio Troianorum, in qua utitur argumentis quae in rhetoricis commemorat Cicero IX 611; declamatorie hos versus explicuit X 230; argumentatur a facili X 375; a fortiore X 541; oratorie agit XI 343, 378; laudat ex gente XI 432; elements of *laus* XII 277; argumentum a necessario XII 637; rhetoricum (i. e. in the genus deliberativum) est, in omni petitione hoc observare, et est controversiae schema II 69; cf. 135; nota omnes suasoriae partes hoc loco contineri II 288 rhetorica suasio II 638; notandum sane quia controversiarum more epilogos dedit sex istis prioribus libris quos et esse *bioticos* voluit III 718; suasoria est omni parte plena IV 31; haec oratio rhetorica suasio est VIII 374; et est *color* qui in *coniecturali statu* saepe requiritur II 150; veniali utitur *statu* IV 333; remoto ingrati crimine descendit ad causam IV 337; quasi *status* finis latens IV 339; invectio quae semper *statu* caret IV 364; ὅπος βίαιος, argumentatur enim V 383; veniali (scil. statu) utitur VI 456; de qualitate transit ad finem VII 367; statum esse absolu-

tum X 31; est status finitivus X 68; agit coniectura XI 392; et finita oratione subiungit epilogos II 141; *πάθος* III 364; IV 1; I 26; misericordia captatur a luco III 646, movet miserationem ab aetate VII 531; pathos fecit VII 374; paene omnes partes habet de misericordia commovenda a Cicerone in rhetoricis positas IX 479; pathos per personam poetae proferendum IX 725; pathos ex aetate movit IX 748; nam hoc praecipit ars rhetorica ut epilogi, etc. X 55; locis omnibus (*τόποις* EGS.) commovet commiserationem, ab aetate, a tempore, a vulnere, a spe parentis XI 42; 243; ex aetate *πάθος* movit XII 611; haec et vicem epilogi possunt obtinere III 314; *σχῆμα διαβολας* II 413; oratorie ibi finivit, ubi vis argumenti constet IV 361; bono colore IV 613; hoc colore futuram orationem ostendit IX 124; color est IV 128; Statius hinc trahens colorem IX 212; hinc traxit colorem Iuvenalis IX 495; ad *auxesin* illius qui occidendus fuerat IX 702.

Note. Public worship in the temples of the pagans, during day-time or night, either, was prohibited by Theodosius in 381, v. Clinton *Fasti Romani*, vol. 1, p. 503, column 3. Gregorovius is ill pleased with him for this. James Russell Lowell's phrase of 'murdered paganism' is not felicitous, however sententious, and not at all historically profound. There are two passages in Servius and in Macrobius, which seem to imply that *cremation* of human corpses was forbidden by an imperial constitution. Serv. 6, Aen. 224 . . . , "Per noctem autem *urebantur* (why not *uruntur*) unde et *permansit* ut mortuos faces antecedant". Add on Aen. III 68 '*Romani contra faciebant, comburentes cadavera*' To this add Macrobius. Sat. 7, 7, 4: deinde *licet urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro saeculo nullus sit*, lectio tamen docet. . . .

E. G. SIHLER.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, March 30, 1909.